U.S. Army
Fort Richardson, Alaska

Interim Remedial Action Report
Operable Unit C – Eagle River Flats



May 2003

Prepared By:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Alaska District
Environmental Engineering Branch
P.O. Box 6898
Anchorage, Alaska 99506-6898

ACRONYM LIST

AAC	Alaska Administrative Code
ADEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
ADFG	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
AR	Army Regulation
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	*Code of Federal Regulations*
CRREL	Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory
CWA	Clean Water Act
DPW	Directorate of Public Works
ERF	Eagle River Flats
EOD	Explosive ordnance disposal
FFA	Federal Facility Agreement
FS	Feasibility Study
GIS	Geographical Information System
HE	High Explosive
IC	Institutional Controls
IRAR	Interim Remedial Action Report
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NPL	National Priorities List
OB/OD	Open Burn/Open Detonation
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
OU	Operable Unit
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
QAPP	Quality Assurance Program Plan
RA	Remedial Action
RAB	Restoration Advisory Board
RAO	Remedial Action Objectives
RAR	Remedial Action Report
RAT	Remedial Action Team
RAWP	Remedial Action Work Plan
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WP	White phosphorus

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document presents the Interim Remedial Action Report (IRAR) for the U.S. Army at Eagle River Flats (ERF), Operable Unit C (OU-C), Fort Richardson, Alaska. Eagle River Flats is one of two OU-C source areas. The objectives of the remedial action at ERF are designed to ensure the protection of human health and the environment by:

- Reducing the white phosphorus present in ponds that are utilized by waterfowl for feeding.

- Reducing waterfowl mortality due to the ingestion of white phosphorus.

The major components of the remedy are:

- Pumping permanent ponds dry to allow for the sublimation and oxidation of the white phosphorus present in the pond.

- Sampling of ponds under treatment to determine that white phosphorus concentrations are being reduced.

- Conducting waterfowl mortality studies to determine quantity and location of ducks that are dying due to white phosphorus.

This remedy, as outlined in the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Record of Decision (ROD) (dated September 1998), was chosen to reduce the concentration of white phosphorus and thereby reduce the waterfowl mortality.

The remedial action began the summer of 1999 and pond pumping is intended to continue through summer 2003. At that time, monitoring activities and waterfowl mortality studies will continue as outlined in the ROD to determine if the remedial objectives have been met. The plan will be re-evaluated during the 5-year review.

1.1 Fort Richardson Background

Fort Richardson was established in 1940 as a military staging and supply center during World War II. It now occupies approximately 62,000 acres bounded to the north by Knik Arm, to the west by Elmendorf Air Force Base, and to the south by the Municipality of Anchorage. Appendix B includes a location map of Eagle River Flats and Fort Richardson. The current mission of Fort Richardson is to support the rapid deployment of Army forces from Alaska to the Pacific Theater.

In June 1994, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) included Fort Richardson on the National Priorities List (NPL). Following negotiations, the Army, USEPA, and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) signed a

Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) for Fort Richardson on December 5, 1994. The FFA outlines the approach for a thorough investigation of suspected historical hazardous-substance sources. It also calls for cleanup activities that will protect public health and welfare and the environment in accordance with state and federal laws.

The FFA divided Fort Richardson into four Operable Units (OUs, named with letters A through D) to represent the potential source areas for hazardous substances. The OUs were created based on the amount of existing information, the similarity of contamination, and the level of effort required to complete a Remedial Investigation (RI). In 2000, an additional Operable Unit, OU-E, was added. This Remedial Action (RA) report focuses on OU-C.

1.2 Operable Unit C Background

OU-C consists of a 2,160-acre salt marsh that makes up ERF and an 8-acre gravel open burn/open detonation (OB/OD) ordnance disposal pad on the eastern edge of ERF. Appendix B includes a map showing these areas.

1.2.1 Eagle River Flats

ERF is a 2,160-acre, cornucopia-shaped, estuarine salt marsh at the mouth of the Eagle River. It is surrounded by forested uplands on the west, south, and east sides, and bounded by the Knik Arm on the north. The Eagle River flows through ERF from southeast to northwest, ultimately discharging into Knik Arm. Two creeks, Clunie and Otter, also drain into ERF.

The ERF area has been used for artillery training since 1949 and contains numerous targets and craters created by artillery shells in the wetlands and associated mud flats. However, observations made during the on-going remedial action suggest that the numbers of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) in ERF is a small percentage of the overall number of UXO indicated in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). Extensive pumping and draining of ponds have revealed only a few dozen UXO on the pond bottoms. This number is a rough estimate based on input from UXO technicians working on the project, and recollections of an average of less than six UXOs found each season. The corrosive salt marsh environment has rusted and destroyed many potential UXOs. Once a projectile casing is corroded and the explosive filler exposed, the extreme reducing conditions of the salt marsh will prevent migration of any dissolved explosives from the filler. Since 1990 all UXOs (approximately 100) found on the surface in Eagle River Flats in the course of the remedial investigation and the remediation phases of the project have been destroyed in place. These are destroyed by Fort Richardson EOD personnel per their standard procedure of using an explosive charge of C-4 and detonating in place.

ERF serves as an important staging ground for migrating waterfowl during spring and fall migrations due to its wetland status. It supports local populations of fish, birds, mammals, and macro invertebrates (primarily insects, snails, and crustaceans). In addition, the many small-interconnected ponds provide excellent habitat for dabbling ducks and other waterfowl.

1.2.2 OB/OD Pad

The former OB/OD Pad, also referred to as Demolition Area One or Demo 1, is an 8-acre clearing with a 4-acre gravel pad constructed along the east side of ERF. Open burning and open detonation of explosives on Fort Richardson historically have been performed on this pad since at least 1956, according to aerial photography. No OB/OD activities have been performed on OB/OD Pad since November 1988. The pad contains the remains of destroyed surplus and outdated munitions, along with assorted objects such as junked vehicles.

An RI at the OB/OD Pad in 1996 that included sampling and analysis of soil and groundwater indicated that concentrations of detected chemicals were considerably below regulatory levels specified in the *Operable Unit C RI/FS Management Plan, Fort Richardson, Alaska,* prepared in 1996. In addition, the ecological and human health risk assessments completed during the RI indicate that the risks are very low.

In addition, the OB/OD Pad is restricted from public access. Entry onto the pad is by road with a locked gate. Access is controlled and monitored by the Range Control at Fort Richardson. These restrictions are not expected to change. Because of the potential unexploded ordnance (UXO) hazard in the area, the OB/OD Pad is not available for future development. Institutional Controls (IC) at OU-C have been implemented. (See paragraph 6.3).

The OB/OD Pad, which was designated a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulated unit, was scheduled for closure under 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) 265, Subparts G and P. This area was included in OU-C under the FFA. The process for closing the OB/OD Pad in accordance with RCRA regulations is detailed in Sections 9.4 and 9.4.1 of the ROD for OUC.

1.3 Operable Unit C Site Investigation and Remedial Action History

1.3.1 1980s

In 1980, Army biologists noticed an unusually high number of waterfowl carcasses, including several dead swans, in the ERF marshes. Subsequent, random searches by the Army, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) discovered abnormally high numbers of dead waterfowl, indicating a serious problem. Ground searches conducted in September 1983 found 368 waterfowl carcasses, including about 35 fresh carcasses. In August and September 1984, about 175 carcasses were discovered. At that time, the Army estimated the number of waterfowl deaths to be between 1,500 and 2,000 per year. In a later study, a series of aerial and ground surveys in 1988 documented more than 900 waterfowl carcasses and feather piles in one area of ERF.

Several preliminary studies that focused on finding the cause of the mortality were conducted between 1982 and 1987. Although the results of these studies eliminated a number of possible causes from consideration, the actual cause of the mortality was not identified. In late 1987, an interagency task force was formed to identify the cause of waterfowl deaths and recommend remedial alternatives. The ERF Task Force consisted of representatives from the U.S. Army Alaska, USEPA, USFWS, ADFG, and ADEC. After the formation of the ERF Task Force, several studies and investigations were conducted to identify contaminants of concern, characterize the nature and extent of contamination, and evaluate potential remedial alternatives. The approach to determining the cause of waterfowl mortality included a review of physical and chemical data and an evaluation of waterfowl behavior based on biological data. The studies initiated to assess waterfowl behavior included bird utilization of habitat and bird mortality studies.

Based on the initial bird utilization and mortality studies results, ERF was originally divided into four Areas: A, B, C, and D. Over time, four other areas of potential concern were identified: Area C/D (between Areas C and D), Bread Truck Pond, Pond Beyond, and the mud flats. Additional research throughout ERF eventually led to the following designated areas, which were the focus for RI and feasibility study (FS) activities: A, B, C, C/D, D, Coastal East, Coastal West, Bread Truck, and Racine Island. Appendix B shows the locations and approximate boundaries for the ERF areas.

1.3.2 1990 – 1993

The results of a 1989 investigation indicated that chemicals from explosive ordnance were the probable cause for the waterfowl mortality in ERF. In February 1990, based on conclusions reached in the 1989 study, the Army temporarily suspended the use of ERF for live firing until the causative agent of waterfowl mortality was identified. Despite the closure, large numbers of waterfowl continued to die at ERF during the spring and fall migrations.

Waterfowl census data for 1988 and 1989 indicated that dabbling ducks comprised the majority of the affected waterfowl and the ducks were continuing to die. The following 1990 field season focused on finding the cause of mortality based on the assumptions that the contaminant(s) resided in sediment, were distributed heterogeneously at ERF, and were slow to degrade.

Field and laboratory studies conducted in 1990 provided evidence that white phosphorus was the likely cause of the mortality. In addition, because white phosphorus persists (does not sublimate and oxidize) when wet or submerged, the water and sediment conditions at ERF are conducive to the long-term retention of white phosphorus in the sediments. ERF investigations performed in the following 3 years focused on defining the extent of the white phosphorus residual matter, determining site conditions and other factors that affect the likelihood of exposure to white phosphorus, and understanding the physical dynamics of ERF. In March 1991, the Army initiated a public review process that evaluated alternatives for the resumption of live firing. ERF was reopened for training uses in January 1992, following a series of test firings. Several restrictions were established, including only allowing firing during winter months after a thick ice cover is formed, preventing disturbance of underlying contaminated sediments. The Army also banned the use of white phosphorus in wetland impact areas nationwide on the basis of discoveries in ERF.

The results of the 1992 and 1993 ERF sampling program for pond sediments and waterfowl carcasses generally confirmed that the highest concentrations of white phosphorus were near Area C and Bread Truck Pond, in a densely cratered area east of Eagle River. The existence of craters is indicative of heavy use for firing. White phosphorus was often used to mark targets for firing and therefore cratered areas were considered to be an indicator of the extent of white phosphorus. In 1993, waterfowl telemetry studies were initiated.

1.3.3 1994-1998

In June 1994, USEPA added Fort Richardson to the NPL. Then, on December 5, 1994, the Army, ADEC, and USEPA signed a Federal Facility Agreement, which outlined the procedures and schedules required for a thorough investigation of suspected historical hazardous substance sources at Fort Richardson. Under the FFA, all remedial response activities will be conducted to protect public health and welfare and the environment, in accordance with CERCLA, the National Contingency Plan (NCP), RCRA, and applicable state laws.

During 1994 and 1995, Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (CRREL) completed several field investigations of the ERF physical system and laboratory studies of white phosphorus's potential to bioaccumulate.

The bioaccumulation studies were performed to assess the impacts of white phosphorus on wildlife at ERF. Additional studies were conducted on waterfowl utilization of ERF, waterfowl mortality, waterfowl distribution and movements in ERF, and toxicological studies of white phosphorus in waterfowl to determine acute lethal doses for ducks (Mallards).

From 1994 through 1997, the ERF investigations focused on finding a feasible remedy for white phosphorus residual matter in sediments. Priority cleanup areas were evaluated by using data from white phosphorus sampling, waterfowl telemetry, carcass transects, physical system dynamics, and mapping of land covers (combinations of topographical features such as ponds and vegetation). A comprehensive geographical information system (GIS) database, established in 1994 and continuously updated, contains results of all ERF data. This information has been used to determine the nature and extent of white phosphorus at ERF and plan feasibility studies for possible remedial actions.

Results of a 1994 CRREL study showed that white phosphorus particles remained intact and relatively unaffected in water-saturated sediments, but began to immediately degrade and disappear when the sediments became unsaturated, especially at warmer temperatures (>15°C). Therefore, sublimation/ oxidation was determined to be a viable remedial option for mud flats and intermittent ponds that have the potential to drain and dry. This conclusion led to additional feasibility studies in 1994 through 1998 to determine potential technologies that could be used in ERF to result in pond draining and drying of sediments so that degradation would occur.

In 1994, Pond 285 (0.9 acres) on Racine Island was capped and filled as part of a treatability study. In 1995 and 1996, small areas of contaminated sediments (<1.5 acres total) were removed from Pond 146 by a remote-controlled dredge during another treatability study. In 1996, Pond 109 (8.2 acres) was drained by a blasted ditch. In 1997, Pond 293 (1.5 acres) on Racine Island was drained by a blasted ditch. A single pump system was also used in 1997 to temporarily drain Pond 183 in Area C as part of an initial treatability study. In 1998, a full-scale pump system treatability study was conducted using six pump systems. Pumps were deployed in Ponds 183, 155, and 146 in Area C, and Ponds 290, 256, and 258 in Area A. After the 1998 season, Pond 290, a small isolated pond in Area A with limited WP residual matter, was successfully remediated after only one season. This success was encouraging but not thought to be the norm for other ponds. A rough time estimate, based on good remediation conditions (soil type, precipitation, tidal flooding, and temperature) is three years.

Based on the results of these feasibility studies, pond draining by pumping was chosen as the preferred alternative for remediating the areas impacted by residual matter of ERF. The Record of Decision describing this selected remedy was signed in September 1998.

1.4 Community Relations

The public has been encouraged to participate in the remedy selection process. Interested citizens were encouraged to comment on the Proposed Plan and remedy selection process following publication of the Proposed Plan in February 1998, during a public meeting held at the Russian Jack Springs Chalet on February 12, 1998, and throughout the comment period ending March 6, 1998. Information on OU-C was made available in the administrative record and information repositories at the following locations: Fort Richardson Public Works Building 724; University of Anchorage Consortium Library; Alaska Resources Library & Information Services (ARLIS); and Fort Richardson Post Library.

Community relation activities for OU-C include:

- Conducting community interviews and developing a Community Relations Plan in 1994;
- Formation of the Biological Technical Advisory Group (BTAG) in December 1995 prior to starting the RAB;
- Initial Environmental Restoration Newsletter (CERCLA Fact Sheets) was published in June 1995 and quarterly publication has continued (with some exceptions);
- CERCLA oriented Public Meeting held in June 1995 at the Russian Jack Springs Chalet and held quarterly until the RAB was formed;
- Army solicited interest in the RAB starting in January 1996 with a questionnaire published in the Environmental News Letter;
- RAB membership solicited in March 1997 through public notices in Environmental News Letter and local newspapers;
- First RAB meeting held on October 9, 1997 and held quarterly since that time; and
- RAB meetings included site visits and presentations on remediation progress.

The public has been encouraged to stay informed and to participate in ongoing remedial actions. Updates on the effectiveness of the remedial action, informational fact sheets, and public notices continue to be made available for the public. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) continues to meet quarterly in Anchorage, and interested citizens are invited to participate.

The Community Relations Plan is in the process of being updated. The current version is available in the information repositories located at the University of Alaska Anchorage Consortium Library, Alaska Resources Library and Information Services, Fort Richardson Post Library, and the Administrative Record at Building 724 on Fort Richardson.

2.0 OPERABLE UNIT C

2.1 Record of Decision Requirements

2.1.1 Selected Remedy for OU-C

The major components of the preferred remedy for OU-C are listed below. Pond remediation treatment will occur between 1999 and 2003, and will be followed by long-term monitoring from 2004 to 2018.

- Treat white phosphorus-contaminated sediment by draining ponds with pumps for five summers beginning in 1999. Pumping will allow the sediments to dry and the white phosphorus to sublime and oxidize. The treatment season will begin in May and end in August or September. A pond elevation survey will be conducted to determine the optimal pump placement. To enhance drainage, explosives may be used to make sumps for the pumps and shallow drainage channels. These shallow drainage channels will enhance the hydraulic connectivity between ponds to encourage drainage.
- Implement the following protective procedures to minimize disturbances to wetlands habitat:
  - Restriction of activities that disturb wildlife in Area B and Area D, which are prime waterfowl habitat areas
  - Selection of the narrowest and shortest walking corridors to minimize disturbances to vegetation and habitat
  - Proper maintenance of equipment and structures
  - Minimize the use of equipment and staging-area footprints
  - Minimal localized use of explosives
  - Preparation of work plans and solicitation of agency reviews
  - Monitoring for impacts to wetlands habitat
  - Monitoring for waterfowl use of ERF
- Sample pond bottoms for white phosphorus at the beginning of the treatment season to confirm or determine that the pond or area requires remediation. The sampling also would establish a white phosphorus baseline and determine additional areas that may require remediation. The baseline sampling would be performed at the beginning of each field pumping season (every year for the first 5 years, starting in 1999).
- Sample pond bottoms for white phosphorus after treatment to determine effectiveness of the treatment system. This verification sampling would be

performed at the end of each field pumping season (every year for the first 5 years, starting in 1999).

- Perform telemetry monitoring and aerial surveys every year for the first 5 years concurrently with pumping activities to determine bird populations, usage, and mortality. These activities would begin in 1999. Monitoring would be continued for 3 additional years to verify that short-term goals are maintained. Monitoring also would be conducted at Year 10, Year 15, and Year 20 to ensure that remedial action objectives continue to be maintained.

- Perform limited aerial surveys and ground truthing during Year 9 to Year 20 to evaluate waterfowl mortality, physical habitat changes, and vegetation rebound.

- Perform aerial photography every other year for 10 years (beginning in 1999) to monitor habitat changes resulting from remedial actions. Changes in drainage, topography, and vegetation would be evaluated.

- Perform habitat mapping once every 4 years for 20 years to evaluate impacts to habitat as a result of remedial actions, as well as to observe habitat rebound after pumping is discontinued.

- Perform limited hazing (only as a contingency) during first 5 years starting in 1999 if incidental hazing from pumping operations and other fieldwork activities does not deter bird usage.

- After remedial action objectives are achieved and pumping is discontinued, apply cap-and-fill material in ponded areas that did not drain and dry sufficiently to enable the white phosphorus to sublime and oxidize. Cap-and-fill material placement is expected to occur in Year 5 (2003).

- Monitor cap and fill material integrity every year for 4 years after the material is placed, and also at Year 10, Year 15, and Year 20.

- Incorporate white phosphorus sampling, telemetry, aerial survey, habitat, and physical landform data into a GIS database. Perform GIS management every year for the first 8 years, starting in 1999, and then during Year 10, Year 15, and Year 20.

- Maintain institutional controls, including the restrictions governing site access, construction, and road maintenance and the required training for personnel who work at OU-C source areas. The objective of these institutional controls is protection of human health, safety, and the environment by limiting or preventing access to contaminated areas or otherwise denying exposure pathways.

2.1.2 RA Objectives

As part of the RI/FS process, remedial action objectives (RAOs) were developed in accordance with the NCP and USEPA guidance for conducting RI/FS investigations. The primary objective of the remedial action is to reduce the number of waterfowl deaths attributable to white phosphorus.

Short and long-term RAOs for the remedial action at OU-C are as follows:

- Within 5 years of the ROD being signed, reduce the dabbling duck mortality rate attributable to white phosphorus to 50 percent of the 1996 mortality rate attributable to white phosphorus. Radio tracking and aerial surveys suggest that about 1,000 birds died from white phosphorus at ERF in 1996. Therefore, the allowable number of duck deaths from white phosphorus would be approximately 500.
- Within 20 years of the ROD being signed, reduce the mortality attributable to white phosphorus to no more than 1 percent of the total annual fall population of dabbling ERF ducks. Currently, that population is about 5,000. Therefore, the allowable number of duck deaths from white phosphorus would be approximately 50. This long-term goal could be adjusted based on future population studies conducted during the monitoring program.

These objectives will be achieved by reducing the area of white phosphorus-contaminated media and thus reducing waterfowl exposure to white phosphorus. Reducing the exposure to white phosphorus will reduce the availability of white phosphorus to ducks, which in turn will reduce duck deaths.

2.1.3 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARAR)

2.1.3.1 Chemical-Specific Requirements

- On the basis of available information collected to date about the chemicals of concern associated with past activities at OU-C, white phosphorus at ERF has been identified as the chemical of concern. Currently, there are no promulgated numerical cleanup or discharge limitation values for white phosphorus; therefore, there are no chemical-specific ARARs for potential remedial actions at OU-C.

2.1.3.2 Location-Specific Requirements

- Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 404: Section 404 of the CWA, which is implemented by the USEPA and the Army through regulations found in 40 CFR 230 and 33 CFR 320 to 330, prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill materials into waters of the United States without a permit. This statute is applicable to the protection of wetlands at ERF. Section 404 of the CWA authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into all "waters of the United States (including wetlands)." The definition of "discharge of dredged material" was revised by the USEPA and USACE (*Federal Register*, 58:45008) on August 25, 1993. Under the newly defined "discharge of dredged material," USACE regulates discharges associated with mechanized land clearing, ditching, channelization, and other excavation activities that destroy or degrade wetlands or other waters of the United States under Section 404 of the CWA.

The substantive requirements of the CWA Section 404 (b)(1) guidelines (hereinafter referred to as the Guidelines) are applicable to cleanup activities that involve water discharges from the pumping operations and channel clearing conducted in wetlands at ERF. The Guidelines were promulgated as regulations in 40 CFR 230.10 and include the following:

- 40 CFR 230.10(a) states that no discharge of dredged or fill material will be permitted if a practicable alternative exists to the proposed discharge that would have less impact on the aquatic ecosystem, as long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences.
- 40 CFR 230.10(b) states that no discharge of dredged or fill material will be permitted if it causes or contributes to violations of any applicable state water quality standard or violates any applicable toxic effluent standard or discharge prohibition under CWA Section 307.
- 40 CFR 230.10(c) prohibits discharges (or activities) that will cause or contribute to significant degradation of the waters of the United States.
- 40 CFR 230.10(d) states that when a discharge (or activity) would degrade the waters of the United States, and there are no practicable alternatives to the discharge, compliance with the Guidelines can be achieved generally through the use of appropriate and practicable mitigation measures to minimize or compensate for potential adverse impacts of the discharge (or activity) on the aquatic ecosystem.

2.1.3.3 Action-Specific Requirements

- Alaska Oil Pollution Regulations (Title 18, *Alaska Administrative Code,* Chapter 75 [18 AAC 75]) set requirements for discharge reporting, cleanup, and disposal of hazardous substances for spills of hazardous substances to Alaska's land or water within specified time frames. The broad ADEC definition of "hazardous substance" includes constituents such as oil and other petroleum products. The selected remedy will involve the use of onsite diesel generators to power the pump systems. These regulations are applicable for the discovery and cleanup of spills of diesel fuel or other hazardous substances at OU-C that are regulated by the State of Alaska.
- Alaska Water Quality Standards (18 AAC 70) in general, apply to groundwater and surface water and establish criteria for protected classes of water use. Where water is used for more than one purpose, the most stringent water-quality criteria ARARs will be used. Eagle River is protected for all water use classes. Specific criteria applicable to Eagle River will depend on the parameter being evaluated and the potential impact or discharge that may occur as a result of implementation of the remedy. The "Criteria for Growth,

Propagation of Fish, Shellfish, other Aquatic Life and Wildlife" are the most stringent and, therefore, applicable to OU-C. Because pumping and installation of cap-and-fill material may affect surface water, these ARARs are applicable.

- Regulations contained in 40 CFR 266, Subpart M, specify when military munitions become solid, and possibly hazardous, wastes and include requirements for storage and transportation of military munitions wastes that are designated as hazardous waste.

2.1.3.4 To-Be-Considered Criteria or Guidance

- Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the treaties cited therein: This statute implements the 1916 Convention between the United States and Great Britain (for Canada) for the protection of migratory birds. It establishes a federal prohibition, to be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior, against the illegal taking of migratory birds. This prohibition applies to birds included in the respective international conventions between the United States and Great Britain, Mexico, Japan, and the Soviet Union. Fort Richardson is implementing remedial action at ERF primarily to protect migratory birds, to satisfy the intent of this treaty.

- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands: 40 CFR 6, Subpart A sets forth USEPA policy for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands. These regulations are applicable to cleanup and monitoring activities conducted in ERF wetlands. Activities will be conducted during implementation of the selected remedy to minimize adverse impacts to the wetlands.

- Army Regulation (AR) 210-20 (Master Planning for Army Installations) explains the concept of comprehensive planning and establishes policies, procedures, and responsibilities for implementing the Army Installation Master Planning Program. It also establishes the requirements and procedures for developing, submitting for approval, updating, and implementing the Installation Master Plan.

- AR 190-13 (Enforcement of Hunting, Trapping and Fishing on Army Lands in Alaska): Appendix B in this Army regulation describes enforcement of hunting, trapping, and fishing laws on Fort Richardson, Alaska. The appendix lists the Eagle River Flats Impact Area, including a 300-meter buffer zone, as closed to all hunting and fishing; and also specifies that no fishing or watercraft are allowed in the Eagle River Flats Impact Area.

- AR 385-63 (Access Restrictions to Army Impact Areas and Ranges): Range safety, trespassing precautions, and education programs for range impact areas are included in Chapter 2 of this Army regulation. The regulation requires that standard operating procedures (SOPS) be published for the safe operation and use of ranges and that ranges, maneuver areas, and training facilities be maintained and managed. In addition, range boundaries must be surveyed and posted as off-limits to prevent trespass by unauthorized personnel. This regulation also includes precautions that must be taken to prevent all unauthorized persons from entering the surface danger zones of a range before firing, trespassing on target ranges during firing, and entry into an impact area by unauthorized personnel until it has been searched and any duds are destroyed. Access for training maneuvers may be permitted upon completion of a visual surface clearance operation. Education requirements included in the regulation specify that all personnel must be properly cautioned on the dangers of unexploded ordnance (UXO); military family members must be instructed that ranges are off-limits and cautioned about the hazards; and the local news media will be used periodically to warn nearby communities of the hazards in trespassing on range areas and handling UXO.

- AR 350-2: Chapter 5 of this AR addresses impact areas, which include a high hazard impact area such as ERF. In the regulation, a high hazard impact area is defined as an impact area that is permanently designated within the training complex and used to contain sensitive high explosive (HE) ammunition and explosives and the resulting fragments, debris, and components. The regulation also requires that all impact areas be marked with warning signs, barriers, and/or guards. Passing any of these hazard warnings without Range Control permission is forbidden. Entry into an impact area must be approved by Range Control. In addition, the regulation requires that anyone observing personnel or vehicles in an impact area inform Range Operations immediately. Range Control will investigate, and request military police assistance, at the site.

2.2 Remedial Design Summary

The objective of this remedial action is to temporarily drain ponds to allow the pond sediments to dry and allow white phosphorus to sublime and oxidize. This action consists of draining ponds using mechanical pumps after flooding cycles and/or rain. After several drying periods and verification sampling (approximately 5 years), capping and filling would be performed in areas where white phosphorus remains.

In the summer of 1997, this technology was tested through a pond pumping treatability study. Baseline and verification sampling was performed before and after pumping and the results showed an 80 percent decline in white phosphorus concentrations in the top 3.5 inches of sediments.

In each pond system, a dedicated pump system is installed annually after spring breakup and is removed before the winter freeze. The typical useful drying season is mid-May to mid-September with the emphasis on the earlier, normally drier months. Pumped water is discharged to an adjacent unconnected pond, river, gully, or open area. Mounted on floats, each pump system is completely automated to start and stop at established elevations of pond surface. Scheduled maintenance service and refueling is required.

Typically, explosives are used to create sump holes for placement of the pumps, and to create short ditches for drainage to the pumps. The affected areas are small, and impacts are minimal and temporary.

The pump systems are expected to operate for 5 consecutive years, based largely on tide predictions. Tidal fluctuations affect the ability to effectively dry the sediments. This alternative includes baseline (before the pumping season) sampling of white phosphorus to confirm which ponds require cleanup; and verification (after the pumping season) sampling to confirm that white phosphorus has sublimated and oxidized, or to determine areas that require further cleanup.

After pumping and monitoring, those pond systems where white phosphorus exposure remains a concern would be capped and filled. These areas generally will be isolated and will contain deep depressions that are not connected hydraulically to other portions of the pond system being drained. The cap would provide a barrier between the dabbling waterfowl and the sediment contaminated with white phosphorus.

3.0 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

The following presents a step-by-step summary description of the construction activities for ERF.

3.1 Mobilization and Site Preparatory Work

3.1.1 UXO Clearance

Before workers can enter an area at ERF, the area must be cleared for UXO. After a visual inspection of the ground surface, the UXO contractor uses a magnetometer to scan the area for buried ferrous metal objects. If an object is detected, the spot is marked and flagged. Walking paths and helicopter landing areas used throughout the season are cleared and marked during system installation in the spring.

The RI/FS included an estimate of total number of rounds of UXO that might be in Eagle River Flats. This estimate was based strictly on an estimate of total rounds fired over the years and an assumed dud rate of 5 – 10%. However, experience in the field during the remediation phase of the project indicates that the original estimate may be far too high and that the actual numbers of UXOs may only be a small percentage of the estimated number of UXO given in the RI/FS. Extensive pumping and draining of ponds have revealed only a few dozen UXO on the pond bottoms. The corrosive salt marsh environment may have rusted and destroyed many UXOs. Since 1990, all UXOs (approximately 100) found on the surface have been destroyed in place by Fort Richardson EOD personnel by a standard procedure of detonating an explosive charge of C-4.

3.1.2 Sump and Ditch Blasting

Before deployment of the pumping systems, the location for the pump is determined. The pumps are typically placed in the deepest point in the pond. If necessary, sumps and drainage ditches are blasted. Military engineers blast the sumps and drainage ditches. Shape and cratering charges are used to blast the sumps. Bangalore torpedoes and detonation cord are used to blast the drainage ditches.

3.1.3 Helicopter Transport of Equipment

Heavy lift military helicopters, such as the UH-60L Blackhawk and CH-47D Chinook are used for transporting the heavy pumps and generators to the remote pond locations. The pumps are placed in the deepest part of the pond, generally a blasted sump, and the generators and fuel tanks are placed approximately 230 feet away from the pump.

3.1.4 Helicopter Transport of Piping

Commercial helicopters, such as an Aerospatiale A-Star, are used for sling-loading the piping, check valves and supplemental materials to the flats at the beginning of the season.

Piping is located to run from the pump to an appropriate drainage area on the flats. The piping is clamped together by hand in the field as it is placed on site.

3.1.5 Fueling

Helicopter support is used for fueling activities on site. Large-capacity double-wall fuel tanks (250 – 300 gallons) for onsite refueling are transported to the pumping sites with the heavy equipment at the beginning of the season. Lightweight fuel tanks are used for transporting fuel to the pump systems once they are in place at the ponds. Refueling operations are kept to a minimum to reduce the opportunity of spillage during fuel transportation and transfer.

3.2 Construction of Treatment System

Once the pump systems and piping are transported to the ponds and the generators have been fueled, the system is put into operation. Field startup / shutdown testing of the systems is conducted before full operation.

3.3 Associated Site Work

3.3.1 Check Valves

A check valve is installed for each system. These check valves prevent draining of water from the discharge line back into the sump when the system shuts down. By preventing this backflow, less cycling of the pumps is necessary, which results in less fuel consumption and fewer refueling operations. It also enables the connection of more than one pump into a single discharge line.

3.3.2 Tide Gates

Tide gates are like check valves, allowing water to flow out of a pond system but not in. The tide gates are placed in natural drainage gullies to lessen the inflow to pond systems from tidal activity. Sandbags and bentonite are used to hold the tide gate in place. Use of tide gates at the heads of tidal gullies have been very successful in assisting in the pond pumping remediation and enhancing its effectiveness. High tides in the range of 31.1 to 32.0 ft (Anchorage Tide Datum) that would have normally spilled over into the pond basins have been kept out by the tide gates, thus greatly extending the drying season. Tides over about 32.0 ft still flood into the pond basins. However, the frequency of these tides are much less than the lower range high tides. The tidal gates have played a crucial role in the remediation efforts to date. Without these devices, remediation results would be less successful.

3.3.3 Additional Ditching

After the pumping systems are installed and operational, some areas of the pond may not be draining as intended. If possible, some additional ditching is performed using explosives such as bangelore torpedoes or detonation cord. These small additional ditches allow additional contaminated areas to drain sufficiently to allow drying of the white phosphorus-contaminated sediments.

3.4 System Operation

Once the systems are installed in the ponds, they run autonomously to lower the human exposure to the UXO hazards in the flats. However, general maintenance such as refueling, oil changes, and checking the condition of the system must be done during the treatment season.

3.5 Sampling Activities

White phosphorus (WP) concentrations in sediment are measured to identify areas where remediation is necessary and to test the effectiveness of pond draining on WP concentrations. Three sampling methods are used:

- Composite sampling, used to identify "hot spots" and to verify the success of the remedy
- Discrete surface and subsurface sampling, used to compare WP concentrations over time
- Measuring the amount of sublimation/oxidation from planted WP particles

3.6 Monitoring Sediment Temperature and Moisture

Sediment temperature and moisture are monitored to determine how conducive conditions are for sublimation/oxidation of WP. Twenty-eight (28) accumulated drying days in a season with sediment temperatures above 15 degrees Celsius (°C) has proven to reduce WP particle mass. Monitoring systems equipped with a data logger and monitoring devices are positioned at each pond system. Several systems are connected through the Internet to enable daily monitoring of remediation conditions from remote sites.

3.7 Waterfowl Mortality Study and Aerial Surveys

Monitoring of the movement, distribution, and mortality of mallards is performed each season. Approximately 100 – 125 ducks are captured and transmitters are attached. Radio telemetry is then used to monitor their movements and location at death, if it occurs during the monitoring period. Aerial Surveys are also performed each year to determine bird populations.

3.8 Aerial Photography and Habitat Mapping

Aerial photography of the ERF area is performed every other year to monitor habitat changes. Habitat mapping was performed in 1994 to evaluate impacts to habitat as a result of remedial actions.

4.0 CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

4.1 Summary of Events at OU-C

The Eagle River Flats area (OU-C) has been the subject of environmental investigations since the 1980s. Section 1.3 of this report contains a brief history of the site investigations and remedial action history

A chronological summary of significant events and reports since the signing of the ROD is provided below in Table 1.

Table 1. Chronological Summary of Significant Events at OU-C

DATE	EVENT
September 30, 1998	ROD for OU-C signed
April, 1999	Remedial Action Work Plan and Final Design
May 1999	Installation of Equipment for 1st Post ROD season
May – Sept 1999	First Remediation Season
July 2000	CRREL 1999 Final Report
May – Sept 2000	Second Remediation Season
August 2001	CRREL 2000 Final Report
May – Sept 2001	Third Remediation Season
April 2002	CRREL 2001 Draft Report
May – Sept 2002	Fourth Remediation Season
Ongoing	Continuation of active remediation for 5th season
September 2003	Meet short term clean-up goal
Ongoing	Continuation of monitoring activities
Ongoing (Feb 2004)	Five Year Review
2018	Meet long term clean-up goals

5.0 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND CONSTRUCTION QUALITY CONTROL

5.1 Comparison to Cleanup Goals

The major components of the preferred remedy for OU-C were previously outlined in Section 2.1.1. The components scheduled to occur from 1999 – 2002 have all been instituted with one exception. The telemetry monitoring scheduled to occur every year for the first five years, did not occur in 2000. This was due to a contracting problem as well as low availability of a helicopter at the time due to the high occurrences of forest fires in other areas of Alaska.

The short term RAO is to reduce the dabbling duck mortality rate attributable to white phosphorus to 50 percent of the 1996 mortality rate attributable to white phosphorus within 5 years of the ROD being signed (e.g. 2003). Radio tracking and aerial surveys calculated that about 1,000 birds (waterfowl or ducks) died from white phosphorus at ERF in 1996. Therefore, to meet the short-term RAO, the number of duck deaths from white phosphorus would need to be less than 500. Further refinement of the mortality model has reduced the calculated 1996 overall duck mortality to 655 ducks. Therefore, the allowable number of duck deaths by 2003 is 327. As shown in Table 3, below, duck mortalities in 1999 and 2001 were below this target number and it appears that the short-term objective is being successfully met. However, duck usage of the flats has also been decreasing due to the activities at the site.

The long term RAO, within 20 years of the ROD being signed, is to reduce the mortality attributable to white phosphorus to no more than 1 percent of the total annual fall population of dabbling ERF ducks. In 1996, that population was about 5,000. Therefore, the allowable number of duck deaths from white phosphorus would be approximately 50. However, the duck population has decreased significantly due to the active remediation activities occurring during the time period that the ducks would be utilizing the flats.

5.2 Waterfowl Study

Table. 3. Summary of calculated waterfowl deaths each year since 1996.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Calculated Deaths	**655**	**240**	**355**	**198**	**N.A.**	**87**

Because the mortality data, are obtained concurrently with or immediately after pond pumping remediation and sampling activities that can cause bird hazing, the true mortality will not be known until after remediation is completed and waterfowl usage of ERF is uninhibited by remedial activities.

There is also imprecision when trying to model a larger population with a small subset, as is being done with the radio-collared birds. The mortality model is an attempt to predict what is happening in a transient population of waterfowl in ERF by monitoring a small subset. The model is continually being refined to improve its accuracy. Mortality rates that are being derived from the telemetry data and the mortality model show a decreasing rate of mortality in ERF. This reduction is strengthened by the sediment-sampling program, which is showing a large decrease in the amount of white phosphorus residual matter. The combination of the results of the sampling program with the morality data indicates that cleanup goals are being met.

5.3 Pond Acreage Treated

Although pond acreage treated is not a specific RAO for this project, it is a good indicator that the WP residual matter is being remediated and therefore duck mortality should decrease as a result.

Table 4. Summary of contaminated pond acreage in Eagle River Flats, acreage remediated, and acreage undergoing remediation at the end of 2001.

Total Acreage identified in ROD as contaminated or potentially contaminated	**57.7**
Contaminated Acreage deleted due to successful remediation pre ROD	**-2.2**
Contaminated Acreage deleted due to additional composite sampling	
1999	**-5.7**
2000	**-3.8**
2001	**-2.3**
Contaminated Acreage added due to additional composite sampling	
1999	**+0.3**
2000	**+1.4**
2001	**+0.1**
New Estimated Total Contaminated Area	**45.5**
Total Area Remediated during 1999 and 2000	**-5.2**
Total Area Remediated during 2001	**-15.2**
Total Area still undergoing remediation at end of 2001	**-23.9**
Total Area yet to undergo any remediation at end of 2001 [1]	**1.2**

1 – This area is undergoing remediation in 2002 or 2003.

5.4 Sampling Strategy

Sampling for white phosphorus at OU-C has occurred as described in Section 2.1.1. Results for each year are compared to previous years to determine the progress of remediation. Table 4, above, shows the pond acreage remediated, which is in direct correlation with sampling results for these areas.

Maps in Appendix C shows the pond status for each year since the signing of the ROD, including identifying contaminated ponds, confirmed uncontaminated ponds, ponds undergoing remediation, and ponds that are remediated.

A summary of pond sampling results:

- Pond 183 is clean except for a small, contaminated area that was found beneath some geotextile fabric left on site from previous actions. This fabric has been removed and the area dried.

- Pond 146 is also clean. For example, composite sample 146-2 had WP concentration of 7.31 micrograms per gram (μg/g) in June 1999 and this was reduced to 0.0005 μg/g in September 2001.

- Pond 155 needs further remediation. Drainage at the pond was improved in 2001, resulting in a reduction in the composite sample concentration from 0.45 μg/g in 1999 to 0.005 μg/g in 2001. However, some discrete and subsurface samples taken in 2002 show that WP residual matter is still present. Pumping in an adjacent marsh in 2002 should help in remediating this pond as well.

- Bread Truck pond (Pond 109) samples both discrete and composite, are below the detection limit.

- Pond 730 (Area C/D) and 290 (Area A) are considered clean. No WP was ever detected in the sampling at these ponds. Pumping was performed based on waterfowl mortality in the area.

- White phosphorus residual matter in Ponds 256 and 258 (Area A) is no longer detectable and so these ponds are determined to be clean.

- Pond 293 on Racine Island was drained by blasting a ditch as part of the treatability studies performed prior to the ROD. This area is scheduled to be resampled in Fall 2002.

- Pond 285 and 226 still require additional draining and remediation.

5.5 Assessment of Data Quality

5.5.1 QAPP

A Quality Assurance Program Plan (QAPP) was developed for Eagle River Flats as part of the Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP). This QAPP details procedures and issues relating primarily to the fieldwork to be conducted at ERF, including the collection of measurement data, potential field laboratory analyses conducted at ERF and Fort Richardson, and the handling and shipping of samples to offsite laboratories. These procedures are being followed in implementing the remedial action for OU-C.

5.5.2 Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Procedures

QA/QC procedures were outlined in the QAPP of the RAWP. The overall objective of the QA program is to establish procedures for obtaining data of known and acceptable quality. These procedures have been followed for this project.

The QAPP did not cover analytical QA/QC at offsite laboratories for the analysis of the white phosphorus. The method used was SW-7580. This method was developed by CRREL as part of the OUC project. This method includes generation of a daily calibration (five standards) curve with check standards run every 10 samples. Spike recovery samples are also analyzed.

6.0 FINAL INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATIONS

6.1 Remedial Action Contract Inspections

No official pre- or final inspections for OU-C have been conducted. However, representatives of USEPA, ADEC, and the Army have inspected the remediation activities at various times since the fieldwork began and have noted no significant operational problems with the treatment system. Initiation of the treatment system was authorized through review of work plans and health and safety plans.

6.2 Health and Safety

A Health and Safety Plan is included in the Remedial Action Work Plan and an updated plan is developed prior to each field season. No health and safety problems have been encountered during construction or operation. All personnel requiring access to the site are required to have a current HAZWOPER certification, and attend both a Range Control and Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) briefing each season. Daily safety briefings are held, and additional helicopter briefings are held on days when helicopter operations are required. An UXO technician is used for providing safe pathways when accessing the site.

6.3 Institutional Controls

Institutional controls (ICs) at OU-C have been implemented. Fort Richardson has established a post wide IC policy at all known or suspected contaminated sites. Further details regarding the Army/Fort Richardson IC policy can be found in the OU-D ROD, the U.S. Army Institutional Controls Standard Operating Procedures [APVR-RPW (200-1)], and a Memorandum on Institutional Controls [APVR-RPW-EV (200-1c)], from Major General James J. Lovelace – Fort Richardson, Alaska. This policy is reviewed annually and revised every two years.

This policy ensures that there are limitations on access, water use, excavations, and property transfers as appropriate for the site. At OU-C, controls include a locked gate limiting access, fences and signs around the perimeter of the area, and large signs at access points to Eagle River.

One component of the IC policy involves obtaining an Excavation Clearance Request (USARAK Form 81 a – 1 Mar 02) to prevent undertaking work inconsistent with established ICs at a particular site.

The Directorate of Public Works (DPW) maintains a Geographic Information System database with information on all of the contaminated sites on post. The DPW is responsible for ensuring ICs on Fort Richardson. ICs will remain in place as long as hazardous substances remain on site at levels that preclude unrestricted use.

6.4 Confirmation that Remedy is Operational and Functional

Components of the preferred remedy as described in Section 2.1.1 of this document that were scheduled to occur from 1999 to 2002 have been implemented as planned with one exception. The telemetry monitoring for duck mortality did not occur in 2000. Therefore, the remedy is operational and functional.

7.0 OPERATION & MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES

7.1 Monitoring/Closure Activities

A methodology to determine exit strategies is currently being developed. The exit strategy will rely heavily on documented need and allow the Army, EPA, and ADEC to determine a strategy for monitoring that fits current and anticipated future data needs.

The project managers will evaluate the planned monitoring on an annual basis until RAOs are achieved. They will review the results from the monitoring to determine if conditions are progressing towards achieving the RAOs. Based on the results of the annual evaluation, the project managers will set the operating and monitoring parameters for the next year. The Army will then operate the systems, or perform monitoring as agreed over the coming year, making adjustments as they consider reasonable and in accordance with agreements made during the last annual evaluation. If the project managers can not reach concurrence on the operating or monitoring parameters of the systems, then previously agreed to parameters will be followed until the issue is resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures incorporated in the Federal Facility Agreement.

8.0 SUMMARY OF PROJECT COSTS

Table 5. Project Cost Summary for 1999-2002

Cost Item	**ROD Estimate (1998 $$)**	**ROD Estimate (2002 $$) [1]**	**Actual Costs (2002 $$)**
RA Capital Cost [2]	**$250,129**	**$271,800**	**$50,000 [3]**
RA Operating Cost	**$3,594,000**	**$3,905,000**	**4,965,000**
Total RA Cost	**$3,844,129**	**4,176,800**	**5,015,000**
Projected O&M			
Difference between total project cost and total ROD estimate		**838,200**	**+20%**

1 – ROD costs were adjusted for inflation from 1998 to 2002 using inflation calculator
2 – RA Capital Costs were based on addition of 2 pumps to the six that had already been purchased prior to the ROD. Capital cost for the initial six pumps systems was approximately $600,000.
3 – Actual RA Capital Costs were incurred for additional piping, connexes, and supplemental fuel tanks.

8.1 Comparison of Actual vs. ROD Costs

Actual costs for the first four years of operation are approximately 20% higher than estimated in the Record of Decision. The additional costs are due to the following:

- Costs estimated in ROD for 1999 and 2000 did not include placement of 6 pumps for pumping. It was anticipated that high flooding tides in those years would not be ideal for pumping conditions. However, due to innovations with small tides gates, it was determined that many of the flooding tides would be held back. Therefore, all 6 pumps were placed for pumping in these years.

- Helicopter costs have increased significantly since the ROD costs were estimated. This has primarily impacted the costs of the telemetry work.

- The costs in the ROD did not include costs for the Corps of Engineers support. The costs for this IRAR and the Five Year Review were also not included in the ROD costs.

- Telemetry costs for 2000 were significantly less than estimated in the ROD.Due to difficulties in procuring a helicopter to support this work, the telemetry study was not completed that year. However, some costs were incurred.

9.0 OBSERVATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

9.1 Successes

9.1.1 Tide Gates

Tide gates as described in Section 3.1.3.2 have been successful in optimizing the pond pumping remediation and enhancing its effectiveness. The drying season has been extended, and the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the pumping action has been increased.

9.1.2 Remediation Operations

Logistics for this unique remediation project have been under constant development. Installation and removal of the remediation equipment has been streamlined each season as the equipment and procedures are modified. More efficient use of helicopters and better planning and coordination of ground crews have been achieved each season. This greater efficiency has resulted in cost savings as helicopter time required to deploy and retrieve the equipment has been reduced. It has also extended the remediation season by allowing the rapid deployment, retrieval, and startup of the equipment.

The use of a qualified construction contractor has been essential in the success of the remediation since the signing of the ROD. In 1997 and 1998, equipment was allowed to run out of fuel during crucial periods, resulting in flooding of treatment areas during prime remediation windows. Even small problems crippled operations. Since Weldin Construction took over as the O&M contractor in 1999, operations have been smooth and reliable, with all problems addressed within a matter of days.

The UXO contractor has also been instrumental in the success of the remediation effort, especially since the Army explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) detachment withdrew their support in 1996. However, it is important to have UXO technicians familiar with conditions in Eagle River Flats.

9.2 Problems Encountered and Solutions

9.2.1 Capping

The ROD calls for capping and filling of any remaining hot spots or small contaminated ponds at the end of the pumping remediation project. A Treatability Study testing a potential capping method was conducted in 1994 on Pond 285 on Racine Island. A bentonite and gravel mixture was transported by helicopter and dropped from air. Problems were encountered with getting complete coverage and uniform thickness of the cap material.

Subsequent sampling showed contaminated sediment still available to waterfowl. Also, the bentonite in the capping mixture prevents any possible drying of sediment even when water is drained off. This precludes any further in situ remediation of white phosphorus

If capping is needed in the future to cover any untreated hot spot or small contaminated pond, a bentonite-gravel mixture is not recommended. Rather, gravel alone should be used for any capping. Because of the difficulty of achieving uniform coverage when applying the cap from helicopters, application of a cap should be done from the surface if at all possible. Many areas of ERF are accessible during the winter by truck across the ice-covered surface. Gravel can be hauled directly to the particular site, dumped on the ice surface, spread out, and allowed to melt through and settle over the contaminated area during the spring. Other small areas are accessible during the summer using ATVs along cleared trails.

9.2.2 Helicopters

Helicopter support is a critical factor for all aspects of the remediation and monitoring efforts at ERF. Every year has been a challenge. In May of 1998, the use of military UH-1H aircraft was lost during spring deployment. A commercial helicopter contractor was brought on board for one season to provide the needed support. Starting in 1999, ERA Helicopters was contracted for helicopter support. The Army National Guard has been supplying heavy lift capability throughout the project with UH-60L Blackhawk helicopters. Rigging of the loads has always been a problem due to either a lack of rigging or a lack of qualified Army riggers. To alleviate this problem, rigging equipment was purchased for the project, and the ERF Remedial Action Team (RAT) performs the rigging. This has greatly increased the efficiency of the airlift operations. The Blackhawk helicopter's lift capacity does not allow the generator sets to be moved when filled with fuel. This has required additional time and helicopter cost in moving fuel out to the gensets after they are placed in the pond location. In September 2001, an Active Army CH-47D Chinook helicopter was used to airlift the heavy equipment. The heavier lift capacity of the Chinook allowed the lift of gensets without defueling them, thus increasing the efficiency of the operations.

In 2000, contracting problems were encountered in procuring a helicopter to provide support for the waterfowl telemetry study. Magnifying the problem was a very limited availability of helicopters during the season due to a high instance of forest fires. Also, pilots that are competent and experienced in net gun waterfowl capture work are in short supply. Due to the contracting issue and availability problem of helicopter and pilot, the waterfowl telemetry work was not performed in 2000. Contracting issues have been resolved; however, availability of helicopters and pilots could continue to be a problem. Evergreen Helicopters is working with the ERF RAT to ensure experienced pilots and helicopters are available for performing this work as required.

10.0 OPERABLE UNIT CONTACT INFORMATION AND REFERENCES

10.1 OU Contact Information

10.1.1 USEPA Project Manager

Bill Adams (ECL-112)
USEPA
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-9797

10.1.2 ADEC Project Manager

Louis Howard
ADEC-SPAR
Contaminated Sites Program, DOD Oversight
555 Cordova St.
Anchorage, AK 99501-2617

10.1.3 Army Project Manager

Cristal Fosbrook, (APVR-RPW-ENV)
600 Richardson, #6505, Bldg. 724
Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6505

Mark Preiksat, (APVR-RPW-ENV)
600 Richardson, #6505, Bldg. 724
Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6505

William Gossweiler, (APVR-RPW-ENV)
600 Richardson, #6505, Bldg. 724
Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6505

10.1.4 Design/Remediation Engineers

Charles Collins
Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, (CEERD-RN)
P.O. Box 35170
Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-0170

Michael Walsh
Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, (CEERD-RE)
72 Lyme Road
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

Marianne Walsh
Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, (CEERD-RG)

72 Lyme Road
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

10.1.5 Waterfowl Use and Mortality

John Cummings
USDA-NWRC
National Wildlife Research Center
4101 LaPorte Avenue
Fort Collins, CO 80521-2154

William Eldridge
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage, AK 99503-6199

10.1.6 Ecology and GIS

Charles Racine
Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, (CEERD-RN)
72 Lyme Road
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

APPENDIX A – COST INFORMATION

Actual Final Costs (1999 – 2002) (in thousands 000)

	1999	2000	2001	2002
MONITORING ACTIVITIES:				
Telemetry – including aerial surveys, helicopter support	251	90	295	315
WP sampling /monitoring – including data management and monitoring	163	185	185	185
UXO support	32	25	25	35
DPW Support	7	7	10	15
COE Support	35	40	40	40
TREATMENT ACTIVITIES:				
Pond Pumping – including helicopters	548	509	444	435
Contractor support, fuel	120	145	175	150
Cap and Fill/Bread Truck Gate	0	0	0	30
DPW Support	5	10	11	15
Reports	0	0	0	80
COE Support	35	38	37	40
Hazing (contingency)	0	0	0	0
O&M PER YEAR	**1,196**	**1,049**	**1,222**	**1,340**

Previously Estimated ROD Costs
Capital Cost: 250,129
Operations and Maintenance: ($000)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Monitoring Activities:																				
Telemetry – incl. aerial surveys, helicopter support	250	250	250	250	250	220	220	220	0	220	0	0	0	0	220	0	0	0	0	220
WP sampling /monitoring – incl. data management	170	140	180	175	180	20	30	25	32.5	25	22.5	27.5	22.5	22.5	25	27.5	22.5	22.5	22.5	30
UXO support	35	35	35	35	35	10	10	10	2.5	10	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	10	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	10
DPW Support	25	25	25	25	25	15	15	15	2	20	2	2	2	2	20	2	2	2	2	20
Treatment Activities:																				
Pond Pumping – incl. helicopters, contractor, fuel	295	295	565	565	565	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cap and Fill	0	0	0	0	152	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
DPW Support	25	25	35	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hazing contingency	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
O&M Per Year	810	780	1100	1095	1252	267	277	272	37	277	27	32	27	27	277	32	27	27	27	282

APPENDIX B – LOCATION MAPS FOR EAGLE RIVER FLATS



Figure 1
Location Map



Figure 2
ERF Areas and OB/OD Pad
2000



Figure 3
Pond Groups

APPENDIX C – STATUS OF TREATED PONDS, 1998 – 2001



a. Pond status at the end of the 1998 season and the signing of the ROD.



b. Pond status at the end of the 1999 season.



c. Pond status at the end of the 2000 season.



d. Pond status at the end of the 2001 season.

APPENDIX D – BIBLIOGRAPHY

CH2M Hill (1999) 1999 Field Work Plan for Eagle River Flats. Contract Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, and U.S. Army, Alaska. April.

CH2M Hill (1999) Remedial Action Work Plan and Final Design for Eagle River Flats. Contract Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, and U.S. Army, Alaska. April.

Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (2002) 2001 Remedial Progress Report Operable Unit C (Eagle River Flats) Fort Richardson, Alaska. FY01 Report. Contract Report to U.S. Army, Alaska.

Collins, C.M. (1999) Weather Data for Eagle River Flats. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation: Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p. 99-107.

Collins, C.M. (2000) 1999 Weather Data for Eagle River Flats. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 97-103.

Collins, C.M. (2001) 2000 Weather Data for Eagle River Flats. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 71-78.

Collins, C.M. (2002) 2001 Weather Data for Eagle River Flats. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 121-130.

Collins, C.M. and C.H. Racine (2000) Updated Species List for Eagle River Flats, Alaska. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 115-120.

Collins, C.M., M.R. Walsh, M.E. Walsh, and C.H. Racine (2002) Operable Unit C (Eagle River Flats) Remediation Progress Report Through 2001. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 9-24.

Cummings, J.L., R.E. Johnson, K.S. Gruver, P.A. Pochop, D.L. York, J.E. Davis, J.B. Bourassa, and C.H. Racine (1999) Movements, Distribution and Relative Risk of Waterfowl Using Eagle River Flats: 1998. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation:*

Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p.19-29.

Cummings, J.L., P.A. Pochop, R.E. Johnson, K.S. Gruver, D.L. York, J.E. Davis, J.B. Bourassa, B.S. Dorr, and C.H. Racine (2000) Movement, Distribution and Relative Risk of Mallards Using Eagle River Flats: 1999. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p.19-31.

Cummings, J.L., P.A. Pochop, R.E. Johnson, K.S. Gruver, D.L. York, J.E. Davis, J.B. Bourassa, K. Shively, B.S. Dorr, and C.H. Racine (2002) Movement, Distribution and Relative Risk of Waterfowl Using Eagle River Flats: 2001. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 39-51.

Eldridge, W.D. (2001) Waterbird Utilization of Eagle River Flats From Aerial Surveys: April-October 2001. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 25-38.

Eldridge, W.D., and D.G. Robertson (1999) Waterbird Utilization of Eagle River Flats: April-October 1998. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation: Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p. 7-17.

Eldridge, W.D., and D.G. Robertson (2000) Waterbird Utilization of Eagle River Flats: April-October 1999. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 9-17.

Eldridge, W.D., and D.G. Robertson (2001) Waterbird Utilization of Eagle River Flats From Aerial Surveys: April-October 2000. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 7-17.

Nam S.I., M.R. Walsh, C.M. Collins, and L. Thomas (1999) Eagle River Flats Remediation Project, Comprehensive Bibliography – 1950 to 1998, USA Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Special Report 99-13.

Racine, C.H. (2000) Pond Pumping-Ditching and Habitat Change on Eagle River Flats. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 105-114.

Racine, C.H. (2000) Tidal Creed and Drainage Ditch Erosion at Eagle River Flats in 1999. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 121-125.

Racine, C.H. (2001) Eagle River Flats Database and Environmental Change Monitoring. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 87-89.

Racine, C.H. (2002) Disturbance and Recovery of Permanent Pond Habitat at Eagle River Flats. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 141-144.

Racine, C.H., and P. Berger (1999) Database for Monitoring Remediation Efforts and Success at Eagle River Flats. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation: Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p. 121-124.

Racine, C.H., E.F Chacho, B. Tracy and P. Berger (1999) Monitoring Physical and Biological Changes in Eagle River Flats. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation: Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p. 109-120.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, and R.N. Bailey (2000) Composite Sampling and Analysis for White Phosphorus in Untreated Ponds. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 89-96.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, and R.N. Bailey (2001) Composite Sampling and Analysis for White Phosphorus in Untreated Ponds. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 63-69.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, C.H. Racine and R.N. Bailey (2002) Composite Sampling and Analysis for White Phosphorus in Untreated Ponds. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 111-120.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, and R.N. Bailey (1999) Treatment Verification: Monitoring the Remediation of White Phosphorus Contaminated Sediments of Drained Ponds. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation: Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p. 57-97.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, and R.N. Bailey (2000) Treatment Verification: Monitoring the Remediation of White Phosphorus Contaminated Sediments of Drained Ponds. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 49-87.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, and R.N. Bailey (2001) Treatment Verification: Monitoring the Remediation of White Phosphorus Contaminated Sediments in Treated Ponds. *In*

Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 37-62.

Walsh, M.E., C.M. Collins, and R.N. Bailey (2002) Treatment Verification: Monitoring the Remediation of White Phosphorus Contaminated Sediments in Treated Ponds. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 79-109.

Walsh, M.R. (2002) Eagle River Flats Pond Pumping Remediation Project: Third-Year Deployment under the Record of Decision. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 53-78.

Walsh, M.R., and C.M. Collins (2000) Eagle River Flats Pond Pumping Remediation Project: First Year Deployment under the Record of Decision. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 99 Final Report, p. 33-47.

Walsh, M.R., and C.M. Collins (2001) Eagle River Flats Pond Pumping Remediation Project: Second-Year Deployment under the Record of Decision. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 19-36.

Walsh, M.R., C.M. Collins, and D.J. Lambert (1999) Eagle River Flats Pond Pumping Treatability Study: Full-Scale Deployment of Remote Pumping Systems. *In Interagency Expanded Site Investigation: Evaluation of White Phosphorus Contamination and Potential Treatability at Eagle River Flats, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and M.J. Hardenberg, Ed.). FY 98 Final Report, p. 31-56.

Walsh, M.R. and M.E. Walsh (2002) Remote Monitoring of Remediation Parameters Through a Web-Based System. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 135-139.

Williams, C.R., and G.M. Trachier (2001) Eagle River Flats Wireless Remote Imaging System. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 00 Final Report, p. 79-85.

Williams, C.R. (2002) Eagle River Flats Wireless Remote Imaging System. *In Remediating and Monitoring White Phosphorus Contamination at Eagle River Flats (Operable Unit C), Fort Richardson, Alaska* (C.M. Collins and D.W. Cate, Ed.). FY 01 Draft Report, p. 131-134.

APPENDIX E – EPA AND ADEC CONCURRENCES

Signature Page for ADEC and EPA

SIGNATURES

Signature sheet for the foregoing Interim Remedial Action Report, Eagle River Flats Operable Unit C, U.S. Army Fort Richardson and with concurrence by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Dave Croxton, Unit Manager Date
Office of Environmental Cleanup
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Ernesta Ballard, Commissioner Date
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation